

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application and the rejections of claims 1, 3-13 and 15-23 is respectfully requested. The claims have been amended to clarify the differences between claimed embodiment and the cited references. As amended, the claims are allowable over the references.

The Examiner is thanked for the courtesies extended to Applicant's undersigned attorney during the June 1, 2010 telephone conference, during which the above-identified amendments were discussed in view of the following remarks. Reconsideration of rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-13, and 15-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over at least the references of Henrikson (U.S. Pat. No. 6,894,715), Boyer (U.S. Pat. No. 5,896,128), and Potekhin (U.S. Pat. No. 7,054,820). In particular, the Examiner asserts that Boyer discloses the feature of "communicating a plurality of real time video data streams from each of the plurality of attendees to all others of the plurality of attendees," as recited in claim 1. However, as indicated on Page 2, Lines 14-16 of the March 3, 2010 Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges a distinction between the present invention (as described in Applicant's prior Amendment C) and Boyer in that the present invention does not combine video data streams into a single stream before communicating them to the other attendees. Indeed, Boyer discloses a video

conferencing system which uses a centralized multimedia bridge to combine multimedia signals from a plurality of attendees into a single composite signal for each attendee (Abstract). Since multiple signals are combined into one, “[e]ach user receives just one video stream of the bandwidth, encoding and video standard that they desire.” (Col 2, Lines 38-39) (emphasis added).

Per the Examiner’s comments during the June 1, 2010 telephone conference, Applicant now amends claim 1 to clarify this distinction by including language specifying “wherein said real time video data streams are not combined into a single stream.” As such, claim 1 is distinguishable from Boyer and therefore the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection should be withdrawn. Similar amendments have also been made to the other independent claims 19 and 20 and therefore, it is requested that all 35 U.S.C. §103 rejections be withdrawn. Notably, claim 20 previously included language that streams received by attendees are “not mixed together into a single stream,” however, as discussed with the Examiner, claim 20 has been amended to clarify that the streams *communicated by* the attendees are not combined into a single stream, as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Further, the Examiner has reasserted his rejection of claims 1, 3-13, 15-18, and 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Per the discussion with the Examiner, the claims have been amended to recite “said plurality of

real time video data streams,” rather than “a plurality of real time video data streams” to clarify any issues of indefiniteness. Similar amendments were also made to the remaining independent claims 19 and 20.

Further, since all of the independent claims have been shown to be in allowable form, it is respectfully requested that the rejections for the independent claims as well as the corresponding dependent claims be withdrawn.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the above-identified amendments and remarks, the claims in their present form are patentably distinct over the art of record. Allowance of the rejected claims is respectfully requested. In the alternative, the claims are submitted to be in better form for appeal. Should the Examiner discover there are remaining issues which may be resolved by a telephone interview, he is invited to contact Applicant’s undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below. A Request for Continued Examiner is also being filed along with this Amendment.

If a Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for response is required to make the attached response timely, it is hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for response in the above-identified application for the period required to make the attached response timely. The

U.S. Application Serial No.: 10/730,510
Amendment dated: June 3, 2010

Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge fees which may be required to this application under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 07-2069.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By */Gavin J. O'Keefe/*
Gavin J. O'Keefe
Registration No. 59,916

June 3, 2010

Suite 2500
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978
P:\DOCS\0920\68747\GF4447.DOC